

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on May 20, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 remain in this application, where claim 1 is independent.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1-11 have been amended for non-statutory reasons, such as for better form including beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--, and deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Such amendments to claims 1-11 were not made in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0167820 (Haering) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0198094 (Arbabs) and as evidenced by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0006586 (Xu) and U.S. Patent No. 6,820,838 (Bernards). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are patentable over Haering, Arbabs, Xu and Bernards for at least the following reasons.

Haering is directed to a light-guiding system for the passenger compartment, and is the very same prior art described in the background of the present application, where light from a light-generating unit (3) travels through a light guide (5). As correctly noted by the Examiner, Haering does not disclose or suggest an interlayer interposed between the glass sheets. Arbabs is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Haering.

Arbabs is directed to limited visible transmission blue glasses. As recited in paragraph [0052], two glass plies may be bonded together by an interlayer of plastic, such as with a typical windshield construction.

It is respectfully submitted that Haering, Arbabs and

combination thereof, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

an interlayer of a polymeric laminating material
interposed between the glass sheets,
light-coupling means for coupling light
substantially into the interlayer,
the light coupled into the interlayer being
guided substantially through the interlayer in order
to avoid the light from traveling through the glass
sheets.

Light-coupling means for coupling light substantially into an interlayer interposed between the glass sheets is nowhere disclosed in Haering and Arbabs, alone or in combination. At best, the combination of Haering and Arbabs discloses the light-generating unit (3) of Haering for coupling light into the combination of the Arbabs two glass plies and interlayer of plastic. Without using impermissible hindsight, there is simply no suggestion or motivation to provide light-coupling means for coupling light into an interlayer interposed between the glass sheets, in order to avoid the light from traveling through the glass sheets. Xu and Bernards are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Haering and Arbabs.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 1 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-11 should also be allowed based at least on their dependence from independent claim 1 as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of said claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

For example, a light-guiding assembly with a recess adapted to receive the light-coupling means, as recited in claim 8, is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Haering, Arbabs, Xu, Bernards, and combinations thereof.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
August 12, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101